

Remarks

I. Summary of the Examiner's Objections

In the Office Action mailed April 18, 2003, the Examiner subjected Claims 1-29 of the application to a restriction requirement. On page 2 of the aforementioned Office Action, the Examiner alleged a first group, claims 1-15 and 27-29, were drawn to an electrostatic actuator with a voltage applied to the upper and lower surfaces of the stator electrode; a second group, claim 16, was drawn to an electrostatic actuator with a voltage applied to the stator electrode and the moving electrode; and a third group, claims 17-26, were drawn to a microsensor.

II. Election

Applicant hereby elects to proceed with the invention as defined in the first group Claims 1-15 and 27-29 in the instant application.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present application is in condition for examination. Should the Examiner have any questions with regard to the instant response, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 18, 2003

By: 

Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665